UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,425	03/30/2001	Bryan G. Yamamoto	MPT-001	9393

22888	7590	05/06/2005

BEVER HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP
TRI-VALLEY OFFICE
1432 CONCANNON BLVD., BLDG. G
LIVERMORE, CA 94550

EXAMINER
VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,425	YAMAMOTO, BRYAN G.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thong H. Vu	2142

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 17-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 17-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

1.   Claims 1-14,17-25 are pending. Claims 15-16 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/05 with respect to claims 1-14,17-25 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-14,17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable

over Murray [6,392,668 B1] in view of Ingrassia Jr. et al [Ingrassia, 5,941,957].

4.   As per claim 1, Murray discloses a data display system implemented by

configuring generic client software (i.e.: software module), the data display system

comprising:

a data display frame configured to display a current data record [Murray, the

browser displays a current page, col 5 lines 52-col 6 line 6]; and

a data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a

current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the

current data record, [Murray, the software module selects the corresponding marker

from the list. The marker generation module inserts the marker along with coordinates

indicating proper display position and other parameters into the current page, col 6 lines

48-64].

However Murray does not explicitly detail the data display frame and the data list

frame can facilitate accessing server software over a wide are network.

In the same endeavor, Ingrassia discloses a web page synchronization

mechanism wherein the data display frame (i.e.: web browser) and the data list frame

(i.e.: a browser session list) have been connected to WTS gateway and WTS server

[Ingrassia, session list, WTS gateway synchronized with browser, col 18 line 58-col 19

line 14, Fig 10]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate the client software synchronize a first

frame (document) with a second frame (data source) as taught by Swartz into the

Murray's apparatus in order to utilize the client software. Doing so would provide the

efficiency and flexibility to access and retrieve data over Internet.

5.   As per claim 2, Murray-Ingrassia disclose a parent frame containing the data

display frame and the data list frame [Murray, current page 245, and the marker list 262,

Fig 2].

6.   As per claim 3, Murray-Ingrassia the parent frame further comprises a plurality of

command scripts [Murray, Java applet, col 5 lines 24-35, marker code, col 12 lines 5-

10].

7.   As per claim 4, Murray-Ingrassia the data display frame further comprises a next

button associated with a next command script from the plurality of command scripts

[Murray, a designated button, col 10 lines 8-19].

8.   As per claim 5, Murray-Ingrassia the data display frame further comprises a

previous button associated with a previous command script from the plurality of

command scripts [Murray, other predefined icon, col 10 lines 46-57].

9.   As per claim 6, Murray-Ingrassia the next command script is configured to

request a new current data record as inherent feature of predetermined program

[Murray, a predetermined program, col 11 lines 7-25].

10.   As per claim 7, Murray-Ingrassia the next command script is also configured to

update the current data identifier marker [Murray, insert code corresponding to a select

the marker into the current page, col 6 line 28-col 7 line 5].

11.   As per claim 8, Murray-Ingrassia the next command script is also configured to

request a second set of data identifiers when the current data record corresponds to a

last data identifier in the first set of data identifiers as inherent feature of a list identifier

[Murray, identifier list 260, Fig 2].

12.   As per claim 9, Murray-Ingrassia the current data identifier marker is an arrow as

a design choice.

13.   As per claim 10, Murray-Ingrassia the current data identifier marker is signified by

highlighting the current data identifier [Murray, highlighting effects, col 5 lines 37-50; col

6 lines 28-47].

14.   As per claim 11, Murray-Ingrassia the data list frame includes a set of status

markers for the set of data identifiers [Murray, marker list 262, identifier list 260, Fig 2].

15.   As per claim 12, Murray-Ingrassia the data display system is an email client

[Murray, email, col 5 lines 23-50].

16.   As per claim 13, Murray-Ingrassia the generic client software is a web browser

[Murray, web browser 242, Fig 2].

17.   As per claim 14, Murray-Ingrassia a method of configuring generic client software

(to synchronize a first frame with second frame), the method comprising:

        creating a parent frame containing the first frame and the second frame [Murray,

client software 248, Fig2], wherein the first and second frames resemble a portion of a

display window created using custom client software [Ingrassia, the first and second

browser, col 18 line 58-col 19 line 14];

storing a plurality of commands for the first frame and second frame in the parent

frame [Murray, market list 262 and identifier list 260, Fig 2]; and

storing a plurality of variables for the first frame and second frame in the parent

frame [Murray, parsing and comparison 266, Fig 2];

displaying a first set of data identifiers in the first frame; and displaying a current

data record in the second frame and placing a current data record identifier next to a

current data identifier corresponding to the current data record [Murray Fig 2; col 5 line

37-col 6 line 64].

18.   Claims 17-25 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claims 2-13.

Therefore, claims 17-25 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 2-13.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (571) 272-3896. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see *http://pair-direct.uspto.gov*. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142